The Senate’s last meeting of 2003-2004 convened at 5:00 PM on April 13, 2004. Speaker Hugh Wilder called the meeting to order and invited corrections to the March minutes, which the Senate then approved.

Reports

Committee on Academic Standards
The Speaker invited the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards to give its report first. Faculty Committee on Academic Standards Deb Vaughn (Library) provided the 2004-2005 academic calendar for the Senate’s information (now posted on Senate website). She noted that last year, her committee had suggested to the Office of Undergraduate Studies (the author of the calendar) that Spring semester classes ought to begin on a Monday, which would lessen the conflicts and double meetings that are necessary for Monday-only classes if the semester starts on another day of the week. This suggestion will be implemented, starting in 2006, she reported. Some Senators asked about whether the College would ever observe Labor Day as a holiday. “Next question,” the Speaker responded. Susan Morrison (Associate Provost) said that the only way we could observe Labor Day would be to eliminate Fall Break. Both Peter McCandless (History) and Tom Kunkle (Mathematics) said they thought the semester should end later so that the College could observe Labor Day.

Bookstore Advisory Council
Next, the Speaker recognized David Mann (Political Science), who reported on the Bookstore Advisory Council. Mr. Mann reported that at long last, the Bookstore Advisory council had met in March. There was “significant faculty participation,” he said, and the committee had written its own by-laws, because it is outside the purview and normal procedures of Senate and Faculty committees. He said he would like to hear from all faculty who have comments or concerns regarding the bookstore and textbooks.

The Speaker
The Speaker then gave his own report. He said he had been honored to work with the Senate during his past three years as Speaker, and he thanked the Senators for their hard work and cooperation. He thanked Deb Vaughn for working as the Senate Webmaster and as the projectionist during Senate meetings, a job she volunteered to do last year. Her work has made the Senate proceedings easily accessible to all via the website, and her assistance during meetings has made Senate meetings much smoother, eliminating the overhead transparencies of a bygone, fuzzier era. The Speaker also thanked George Pothering for serving as Parliamentarian, a job that might become especially important in the meeting now underway, he noted. (“But you’re doing a great job so far, George,” Mr. Wilder said.) He thanked Julia Eichelberger for serving as Faculty Secretary, and thanked Bertie Mack for her work in the Secretariat’s office, where she has become proficient at the digital storage of Senate documents. The Senate gave all these people a round of applause.
The Speaker noted that this was the last meeting of the year, and that it would be continued the following week if we had not gotten through our agenda by 6:50 (since the room was booked to someone else at 7). He also reminded Senators of upcoming forums, one the following day and another, on Auxiliary Enterprises, to be held next week. The Spring meeting of the full Faculty would be held next week as well, at 5 PM on Monday; both the President and the Provost would be addressing the faculty. Mr. Wilder noted that graduate and undergraduate commencements would be held May 15 and 16, and faculty presence is much appreciated at these occasions.

Turning to next year’s events, the Speaker reminded faculty of Fall 2004 Convocation. *Middle Passage*, a novel by Convocation speaker Charles Johnson, will be mailed to all incoming freshmen (also available to faculty upon request). He asked faculty to consider adopting the book for their Fall classes. Calling it “an extremely interesting read,” Mr. Wilder noted that the novel could be used not just in English courses, but in many others, such as History, African American Studies, and Political Science. The Speaker then reminded faculty that 2003-2004 Senate and Faculty committees would remain active until August 15, when the newly elected committees would take the reins. Most committees do not work over the summer, but “if you are about to finish something,” you should do so before August. Occasionally, too, urgent issues arise over the summer that require convening a committee. Finally, he reminded faculty, the chair of the outgoing committee is responsible for convening the newly elected committee and seeing that a chair is elected. The names of the chairs should be sent to the Faculty Secretary. Each committee is also responsible for writing a report on its work in 2003-2004, and these reports should be sent to the Speaker.

**New Business**

**Nominations and Elections**

David Gentry, chair, moved acceptance of the slates presented by the committee, reminding Senators that additional nominations are no longer in order. The slate was then accepted by acclamation, as follows:

**Academic Planning (seven faculty with at least four senators):**
Robin Bowers, Psychology
Julie Davis, Communications (Senator)
Jose Gavidia, Management and Marketing
Tom Heeney, Communications
Elizabeth Martinez-Gibson, Hispanic Studies (Senator)
Todd McNerny, Theatre (Senator)
Norris Preyer, Physics and Astronomy (Senator)

**Budget (seven faculty with at least four senators):**
Charles Beam, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Frank Cossa, Art History
Marion Doig, Chemistry and Biochemistry (Senator)
Charles Kaiser, Psychology (Senator)
Susan Kattwinkel, Theatre (Senator)
Martin Perlmutter, Philosophy and Religious Studies
Janice Wright, Hispanic Studies (Senator)

Bylaws (three faculty with at least two senators):
Glenn Lesses, Philosophy and Religious Studies (Senator)
Herb Silverman, Mathematics
Trevor Weston, Music (Senator)

Mr. Gentry then invited additional nominations for the 2004-2005 Committee on Nominations & Elections, noting that this committee would be elected at the full Faculty meeting the following Monday. Marion Doig and Rick Heldrich were nominated, and the slate was closed.

**Graduate Committee**
Sarah Owens brought proposals from the committee. All of the following proposals passed:

Curricular Proposals - Existing Programs
Proposal for a change in the MS in Computer and Information Sciences program
Proposals for three new courses in the MS in Computer and Information Sciences:
1. CSIS 616 – Automata
2. CSIS 656 – Software Systems Design and Implementation
3. CSIS 658 – Software Testing and maintenance
Proposals for five new courses in the Master of Science in Accountancy program:
1. ACCT 515 – History of Accounting Thought
2. ACCT 518 – Financial Case Analysis
3. ACCT 521 – International Accounting
4. ACCT 531 – Advanced Accounting
5. ACCT 545 – Taxation of Estate/Gift Transfers and Deferred Compensation
Proposal for a course change - EDFS 632 - Educational Psychology

The next proposal, for a Graduate Certificate in Organizational and Corporate Communication, was presented to the Senate for information only. Hugh Wilder told the Senate that in 1998 the Senate had approved the practice of not requiring Senate approval for certificate programs (as opposed to programs for a bachelor’s or master’s degree). These programs do not require CHE approval either. The Senate can discuss the program, Mr. Wilder said, but we have no authority over it. Bob Mignone (Mathematics) asked if the course proposals associated with the certificate still needed to be approved. Yes, said Mr. Wilder, any new course must be approved by the Senate (which we would be asked to do shortly). Glen Lesses (Philosophy) said he though certificate programs should be vetted by the Senate. He said he had questions about the coherence of this particular proposal, and that he wondered why these five courses were enough to warrant “a certificate in something.” He also had questions about the costs of the program as a certificate, and future costs should this be turned into a master’s degree. For that reason, he thought we should not approve the courses that were being proposed for this certificate.
Doug Ferguson (Communication) said that his department has been working on this proposal for five years, and that they do not think any of Mr. Lesses’ concerns were significant problems. The department (chaired by Mr. Ferguson) now has 20 faculty, and will eventually have 25. They plan to offer only one course per semester for this program, in the evenings at the Lowcountry Graduate Center. Students will be able to complete the certificate program in 2 years. The department believes there is demand for such a certificate. Mr. Ferguson added that he was planning to teach the course without taking any release time for it in the first year. He said he hoped the Senate would support this proposal, which had already been approved by the graduate dean and council. Hugh Haynesworth (Graduate Studies) said that the Committee on Graduate Education was also satisfied with the proposal. Glen Lesses noted that the Budget committee had not reviewed the program. Frank Kinard asked Hugh Haynesworth if there was information available on how many students are now enrolled in certificate programs and how many such programs are “out there.” Mr. Haynesworth said this information could be found at the Institutional Research website, where we could see how many FTEs were generated by degree candidates and by non-degree candidates in these graduate programs. Mr. Kinard asked if enrollments were rising, and Mr. Haynesworth said that overall, graduate enrollments had increased, though that was not true of all individual programs.

Ms. Owens then brought proposals for five new courses in support of the Communication certificate:

1. COMM 501 – Communication Research Methods
2. COMM 507 – Seminar in Communication Management
3. COMM 510 – Communication Theory
4. COMM 535 – Public Relations Campaigns
5. COMM 580 – Special Topics in Organizational Communication

Mr. Lesses moved “to table these courses” because of the questions he had raised about the certificate. Parliamentarian George Pothering asked whether Mr. Lesses wanted the Graduate Committee to reconsider the proposals. Mr. Lesses said he would like to defer consideration of the courses “until we have discussed the certificate issue.” Mr. Pothering said this would require a motion to postpone the vote indefinitely, which meant it could come up next semester if the committee asked to put it back on the agenda. Sarah Owens said that the committee had looked at these courses three times, and that they were “stand-alone courses, irrespective of the certificate.” Would these courses be used for anything besides the certificate, Bob Perkins (EDFS) asked. No, said Mr. Ferguson. Reid Wiseman (Biology) asked Mr. Lesses to discuss his concerns further. Mr. Lesses said he was concerned that the certificate did not fit our liberal arts mission, that the courses did not seem coherent, and that the program had hidden costs, which we could not know of since the proposal had not been reviewed by the Budget committee. Mr. Wiseman noted that Mr. Ferguson planned to teach the first course without release time. “Or a stipend,” said Mr. Ferguson. “I’m making a considerable sacrifice so that this can go forward.” Mr. Haynesworth said that the proposal was not required to be approved by Budget. “Maybe we should change that policy,” he said. “I don’t think so,” he added, because his committee “looks at these things very carefully.” Mr. Lesses said he was still dissatisfied with the lack of Budget oversight, and said that the certificate still did not seem to him to fulfill the College’s mission. Julie Davis (Communication) said she thought it was “not
fair for the Senate to change the rules now” and begin requiring certificate proposals to be reviewed by the Budget committee. She also said that this certificate did serve the goals of a liberal arts institution, and that it was not a “vocational public relations” program. The courses had theoretical content, she added, and the course descriptions stated that they were designed to improve the critical thinking of students who take them. Mr. Lesses’ motion to table failed. The new courses were then approved.

Next Ms. Owens presented a New Program Proposal for a Master of Science in Historic Preservation. This program did receive the approval of the Budget committee and Academic Planning committees, she said, adding that the program has been in the works for a long time, in conjunction with Clemson University. Robert Russell, director of undergraduate program in Historic Preservation, said that this has been under discussion for many years. Currently the undergraduate program has 120 majors. The graduate program will be taught by both Clemson and C of C faculty, and will be located in Charleston (though not necessarily on the C of C campus). He noted that the Master of Science designation was used by the University of Pennsylvania for a similar program.

Peter McCandless said that the Budget committee was concerned about the proposal. He noted that the proposal anticipated new faculty lines coming from the Fourth-Century Initiative, yet the FCI lines are supposed to be for undergraduate teachers. He also wondered if we would be able to depend on Clemson to continue to contribute financially and to make faculty available to teach in this program. Mr. Russell responded that the new hires in Historic Preservation would teach mostly undergraduates, with no one teaching more than one graduate course per semester. CHE has already approved this program for Clemson, and this proposal will make it a joint program. Its size will be small, with a maximum of 18 students enrolled per year. Mr. Russell added that the cost of the program would be entirely covered by its tuition; the Clemson money would cover “extras” and not operating costs. Hugh Haynesworth added that if Clemson decided to drop out of the program, then it would be phased out at the College as well. Clemson provides courses in areas we cannot cover, such as architecture, he said.

Hugh Wilder noted that Academic Planning had also reviewed this proposal. Bill Olejnczak (History), chair of that committee, said their only concern was over a faculty member who was listed as having only a master’s degree. Hugh Haynesworth said he had been told by Clemson faculty that in this case, a master’s was the terminal degree in that field. “So these salaries are for people with master’s degrees?” asked George Pothering. No, said Mr. Haynesworth; these salaries are for future faculty with PhDs. Norris Preyer (Physics) asked if there would be new courses for this program. Yes, said Mr. Haynesworth, and they will be sent through the regular course approval process. The courses now being taught by Clemson faculty will come before the Senate next fall. Jack Parsons (Political Science) said, “We’re being asked to approve a master’s degree without a curriculum. Why?” Hugh Haynesworth said that something like this had occurred before in the Computer Science program. The Senate then voted on the proposal; the motion carried.

The final items from the Graduate Committee, which were “just tightening up previous
policies that had loopholes,” all passed: the Clarification of the Academic Dismissal policy, the policy regarding grades of Incomplete, and the policy on Probation Standards.

Curriculum Committee

Turning the Senate’s attention to undergraduate curriculum, Norris Preyer brought the following proposals from his committee. Darryl Phillips noted that the courses the division of Languages was proposing to delete were Modern Greek, not Ancient Greek, courses, and that Languages also wished to delete one additional MGRK course currently on the books. This was received as information, since the Senate does not need to approve course deletions. All the other proposals for individual courses were approved.

LACS 105 Introduction to Contemporary Brazil – New Course Proposal
PHIL 450 Seminar in Philosophy – Proposal to Change a Course
MGMT 310 International Human Resources – New Course Proposal
MGRK 101, 102, 201, 202 – Proposal to Delete a Course
SLRTS 270 Studies in Russian Film – New Course Proposal
Minor in Russian Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements
SPAN 445 Phonetics and Advanced Language Studies – Proposal to Change a Course
SPAN 316 Applied Spanish – Proposal to Change a Course
SPAN 317 Introduction to Spanish for Business – New Course Proposal
SPAN 318 Spanish for International Business – New Course Proposal
ENGL 359 Contemporary American Poetry – New Course Proposal
HIST 215 Native American History – New Course Proposal

Next, Mr. Preyer proposed the new major in Latin American and Carribean Studies. This interdisciplinary major will be built out of existing courses, he said, and therefore is not expected to create an increased workload in any department. Representatives from Budget and Academic Planning confirmed for the Senate that they had no objections to the new major. Doug Friedman (Political Science) explained that this major grew out of the LACS minor, which had grown over the past several years. It cannot be the student’s only major, but must be part of a double major, he explained; Mr. Preyer added that no more than 12 hours in LACS curriculum can be “double-dipped” for the student’s other major. George Pothering asked if the college had any other degrees that were only valid as a double major, and Lynn Cherry noted that students with a major in international business had to complete a minor in a foreign language to be awarded a degree in that major. Darryl Phillips asked about the compensation proposed for the director of this program (a $5,000 stipend). “I would like to see the college standardize the compensation rates because there are some that are much less,” he said. Provost Elise Jorgens said she would like to see this happen as well. The major was brought to a vote, and was approved.

Next, Mr. Preyer presented a new major in Hospitality and Tourism Management. He said that this major had been developed in response to Johnson & Wales (a culinary institute) leaving town. The proposed major requires 56 hours and is “very rigorous.” Peter McCandless stated that the Budget committee expressed concern that there was no
money requested for library additions in the proposed budget. Bill Olejnezciak said the Academic Standards committee was concerned about its cost, but that the committee was told that there was new money available for it. John Crotts (Management and Marketing) noted that this program was originally requested by Alex Sanders in 1995. It became a concentration and then a minor. The curriculum was rigorous, he said, and eventually the department hired two new faculty members. “We will not request any resources from the Fourth-Century Initiative,” he said, but only from new state money. Chip Condon (School of Business) said that this proposal has always been conditional on resources coming from legislature or private funding, so it would not take anything from existing College resources. He asserted that the degree was appropriate for the mission of the College and the School, because the College has “a clear public mission to support the state and community.” This program “responds to a state and local need. We’re educating people who will go on to a particular industry, but they are getting the same education they would get with a business major.”

Deborah Boyle (Philosophy) said she was one member of the Curriculum committee who was not in favor of the program, because she was not persuaded that there was a local need for this degree. Trident is building a new hospitality center, she said, and The Citadel is offering a focus on hospitality in their MBA program. Ms. Boyle said she did not think the degree was appropriate for a liberal arts and sciences university. The College of William and Mary, a university that also offers a business degree and is located in a tourist destination, does not have a degree like this, she said. Out of the 20 comparable institutions identified by the Strategic Plan, only 3 offer this major; one of these is a land-grant college and another is not a liberal arts college. Tim Carens (English) said that his department had just discussed this possible major and was in unanimous opposition to it; his department, too, believed that it was not a good fit for a premier liberal arts and sciences institution. Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) raised a concern about cost, saying that even if the salaries were covered by new money, office space would not be, and this campus is still very short on space for its existing faculty and classrooms. Provost Elise Jorgens said that she had spoken to “a number of people in town and in the legislature who very much want to support this program” and who do not see it as equivalent to what Trident offers. The clientele of Charleston tourism “requires people who have a liberal arts background,” she said, adding that she believed this was a rigorous program and consistent with a liberal arts institution that already offers degrees in business and in arts management.

Todd McNerny (Theatre) asked if the $400,000 in the proposal had been allocated by the Life Sciences Act. Mr. Haynesworth said that had not yet happened, but that the proposal was contingent on that money being appropriated. Glen Lesses asked if this were recurring revenue. Ms. Jorgens said it had not yet been made recurring. Mr. Lesses also asked about “this vague source of revenue from the business community.” He thought it might be wise to defer approval until we knew how much money there would be, so the total cost of the program could be calculated. “The legislature is waiting for our approval” before they will commit any money, said the Provost. She said no tenure-track faculty would be hired until the College had secured recurring money to fund the lines permanently. But to acquire such revenue, the College would have to support the
program. Jose Gavidia (Management and Marketing) said he had reviewed the proposal and found its requirements, while different from the existing business degree, to be “quantitatively similar” to the content students would cover in a regular business program, and equally rigorous. Tim Carens questioned the idea that College of Charleston graduates are more appealing to the clientele of local businesses because they have a liberal arts and sciences degree. “I think the liberal arts and sciences should be important in their own right,” he said, and not because they give upscale restaurants and hotels a marketing advantage. The Provost responded that “the liberal arts are wonderful to study” but that the College benefits when businesses “recognize that we prepare people to be successful.” Glen Lesses opined that the real reason this degree was being proposed was the closing of Johnson and Wales, but Norris Preyer said the proposal had actually been underway long before the announcement of Johnson and Wales’ departure. George Pothering inquired about the implementation procedure, and Mr. Crotts said they would search for faculty next year and would eventually get future courses approved. Mr. Pothering noted, “I have concerns about office space. My department has no place for some of the faculty.” Mr. Crotts said the department was not going to grow that much since it was already servicing a number of students in the existing minor. Meg Cormack said she thought “a minor is perfectly appropriate but not a major.” The Speaker then asked if faculty were ready to vote; by a voice vote, the proposal passed.

Since it was now 6:30, Bill Olejnecziak, chair, asked that the Senate adjourn until next week, since they would not be able to finish tonight. The Senate approved, and adjourned until April 20th.

Committee on Academic Planning
The Senate gathered again at 5:00 PM on April 13th, with Hugh Wilder calling the resumed meeting back to order. Mr. Olejnecziak then presented his committee’s proposal to the Senate. (Full proposal is posted on the Senate website.) He noted that the Strategic Plan had charged this committee with creating an academic component for the first-year experience. In accordance with this charge, the committee had worked for two years, during which time the committee members came from four different schools and eleven different departments. Mr. Olejnecziak asserted that the proposal fulfills goals that President Higdon articulated at the full Faculty meeting yesterday--to sharpen the distinctiveness of our institution and to be more of a a “student-centered learning environment.” This committee is in unanimous support of the proposal, which came about after several earlier drafts were presented to deans and chairs and to the Faculty Senate this year. In response to comments made at the December Senate meeting, the committee has made several modifications: the descriptions of the course content have been made more flexible; the use of smart classrooms is now described as “when available”; the stipends and the compensation for a director have both been reduced to lower the cost, and they recommend that whenever possible, departments should make their Freshman Seminar courses fulfill General Education requirements. Mr. Olejnecziak also noted that the committee recommends a director who is part of an academic department. He reminded the Senate that the committee had chosen this model (a 3-hour, special topics seminar) after considering others that had met with strenuous objections from chairs. They also like this proposal because of the richness of the academic content
that it will have. It is still a pilot program, one that invites participation from any
department who wishes to contribute to it. The committee hopes that all 5 schools will
participate. The existing Freshman Seminar course already has a budget, and many of its
sections are now taught by adjuncts; this proposal would not, therefore, net any
significant increase in adjunct use. Of the 2169 courses taught at the College in Fall 2002,
for example, 824 were taught by non-roster faculty. This proposal would only involve 90
sections even if it were ever implemented for all freshmen; hence its impact on total
adjunct use would be modest. Moreover, Mr. Olejncziak said, “this should be a
spending priority.” The College should commit resources to this program because it will
help “make us a superior college.” This proposed freshman seminar will foster the
mentoring of students by roster faculty, starting with their first semester. It is also an
opportunity for faculty to develop new and exciting course offerings in areas of their own
special interest. All these factors make the proposal “an essential building block for the
Fourth-Century Initiative.”

Discussion began with Bishop Hunt (English) noting that the proposal involves a new
standing committee, which involves a change in the bylaws. We can’t approve that
change today, Mr. Hunt said, since this has to be vetted by the Bylaws Committee. High
Wilder agreed, saying we would only be voting to start the process today.
Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology) asked if there were are “any data that show that
participation in these programs does enhance student retention?” Mr. Olejncziak said
that other schools with such a model “have positive retention data.” He noted that this
course would not only stress the sort of study skills that were in the existing FRSR, but
also would give them practice in an academically ambitious course, helping students
“learn to learn” at the college level. Reid Wiseman asked what would happen if only 4
students signed up for a particular subject, and Mr. Olejncziak said he did not anticipate
that. Mr. Wiseman asked how many sections were anticipated for this pilot, and was told
about 30, with about 1/3 of the freshmen expected to participate. Charles Kaiser said he
thought this would increase adjunct use, and that he did not know if it would have any
effect on retention. “You may want to attach an assessment procedure to this,” he said,
and Mr. Olejncziak said this was already in the proposal. He repeated that the adjunct
use would not be much greater in the scheme of 2000 courses, and that many adjuncts
now teaching FRSR would not be replaced by roster faculty in this proposal. Alex
Kasman spoke in favor of the proposal, saying that “the details can be worked out later
after we start it. Those concerns are for down the road.” He knows faculty at the UNC-
Asheville where there is a program like this, he said, and it has grown in popularity and is
now being phased in as a requirement for all freshmen; many other institutions have such
a requirement and it seems to work very well. Marion Doig asked how many sections of
FRSR there were now, and was told there were 37. “So we’re trading 30 sections for 30
sections,” he asserted. Sue Turner asked if smart classrooms would be taken away from
other courses, and Mr. Olejncziak said they would not. Frank Kinard said, “I hate to be a
cynic but it comes easy to me. If you gave every student three hours of A credit that
would have an effect on retention.” He said these courses were not appropriate for
freshmen, who ought to be satisfying their “basic degree requirements” as soon as
possible. Joe Kelly (English) said that he saw no problem with offering these courses to
freshmen, noting that the freshman English program undertakes similar goals for all
entering freshmen. He did note that English department courses now have relatively small numbers since they are writing-intensive, “and we get penalized for it.” In order to insure that this doesn’t happen to departments contributing to this FRSR, “we should count each student in one of these courses as 1.5 students. Otherwise the departments will be penalized for low numbers.” Bev Diamond asked about the director’s role. Would the director still teach in his/her home department? Mr. Olejncziak said yes. The director’s role is only partly fleshed out in this proposal, because this would need to be worked out with the Provost. “The spirit of this proposal is not to micromanage” the working out of these practical details, he said. Ms. Diamond suggested that the proposal would be easier to implement if the committee did not have to include a representative from every school.

Glen Lesses said that people had not had enough time to discuss the proposal and he thought there should be “open forums scheduled” to discuss it. “There hasn’t been a full discussion here,” he said. He moved to remand the motion to Academic Planning in order for them to “vet this” with departments. Darryl Phillips spoke against remanding, saying the proposal was voluntary and departments would have a chance to discuss it while it was still a pilot program. He noted that the process had been underway for two years now, “and I would like us to vote on it this evening.” Susan Kattwinkel, a member of Academic Planning, noted that next year’s committee would have no returning members on it. Jack Parson said he wished to vote on the proposal tonight. “It’s a blueprint,” he said, not a complete plan, and participation is voluntary, and we can look at it again after it has been tried as a pilot. “There is no real reason to wait,” he said.

Elise Jorgens thanked the committee for their proposal, then urged that it be remanded. She said she was “uncomfortable with some things in the proposal.” She wanted the committee to work out a number of things that she thought should be changed, she said. Jack Parson asked if she could tell the Senate what she was uncomfortable with. Ms. Jorgens said she was “not quite happy with the stipend structure,” which she said was “considerably higher than usual stipends.” She thought the adjunct use for these 30 sections needed to be charted out. “I doubt that it is going to be a wash,” she said. “I really do want this to succeed,” she added. Bev Diamond asked if the Provost thought there should be a conversation with chairs. The Provost said she thought that was necessary. She also said there needed to be more discussion of the question of what general education requirements the classes would fulfill. Darryl Phillips said that if the proposal was remanded, it should be sent to an ad hoc committee. “It’s an unfair burden on Academic Planning” to remand it to them, he said, adding that he still thought it should not be remanded. Susan Kattwinkel said that Academic Planning had discussed the proposal with deans and chairs for two years already. “Maybe a new group should take this on,” she said. Henry Donato, also a member of Academic Planning, spoke against remanding. “It won’t be possible to have a program that satisfies every constituency,” he said. “If we wait to make something perfect,” we may never have any program, he said. The Provost said, “I wish there were a way to endorse the philosophy of this program and form an ad hoc implementation committee” to work out the details.” Jack Parsons said, “I still think it would be better that we don’t remand.” He noted that the committee had worked on this for two years. “If we were to approve it as a blueprint,” then the implementation process would begin. No aspect of it is compulsory, and the
Provost would be in a position to work out the logistics. “If we send it back to the committee, we will be back here having this same debate in another 3 years,” he said, “Let’s move forward, then see what needs to be done to fine-tune it.” Todd McNerny also spoke against remanding, noting that the proposal already specifies a committee that would take charge of implementation issues.

Erin Beutel asked if she could move “to send this to an ad hoc committee that would talk to deans and chairs” and at the same time “endorse the spirit of the proposal.” Parliamentarian George Pothering said that she needed to separate the motions. More discussion ensued about what was actually on the floor, and Glenn Lesses withdrew his motion to remand and Erin Beutel withdrew her amendment of this motion, so the Senate now was facing the main motion by the Academic Standards Committee. Bev Diamond moved that “we approve this in spirit but not in the details.” More parliamentary discussion ensued regarding what this meant and whether it could be done. Eventually Ms. Diamond said she wanted to endorse the first two paragraphs. Susan Farrell (English) asked, “Isn’t the Senate an advisory body anyway?” She noted that our proposals are always “in spirit” since we cannot compel the Administration to do anything. Alex Kasman asked if the motion would ever return to the Senate once it were remanded. Mr. Wilder said that it would only return if the committee placed it back on the agenda. Bev Diamond said she did not seek to end discussion of the proposal. Darryl Phillips urged the Senate to amend the main motion so as to address the Provost’s concerns, saying that the Senate could lower the stipends and limit the adjunct use to whatever the Provost specified, since there were only 30 sections proposed. “I would like to see us go ahead with something,” he said. Glen Lesses said, “The Provost has given us some of her concerns. There are probably more. There are probably other questions that will be raised.” Frank Kinard made a motion to divide the proposal, so that the Senate could first vote on only the first two paragraphs. The motion to divide was not debatable, and it passed on a voice vote. Alex Kasman then said that it would be pointless to endorse only the first part of the motion, since it meant nothing by itself. Jack Parson said that implementation details should be worked out by the Provost. Part I, the first two paragraphs, was then voted on, and it passed unanimously.

Next Mr. Lesses moved to remand the rest of the proposal to a new ad hoc committee “to be formed to consider implementation.” When asked by David Mann where this committee would come from, Mr. Lesses said there was a procedure in place in the by-laws for the Committee on Nominations to follow. David Mann said he thought Academic Planning should do the reconsidering of this proposal, not a new committee. Joe Kelly spoke against remanding, stating that all Senate votes are nothing more than recommendations anyway and can only be implemented by the administration. Tom Kunkle said that the Senate should not “hand over” a proposal if it weren’t finished. Senators voted by a show of hands, and the motion, to remand the rest of the proposal to an ad hoc committee, was passed by 28 to 15. Mr. Wilder said that this committee would be appointed in September, and Mr. Olejnecki asked that the committee not try to start from scratch, but use this proposal as a blueprint. Hugh Wilder thanked the members of Academic Planning, and the Senate applauded.
Proposed Changes to the Faculty-Administration Manual

Proposal #1:
Revise section 6.a.1. of the policy (“Rating of Candidates; Rating of a candidate will take one of three forms; Superior Rating”) to read:

The superior rating is awarded to candidates who continue to perform at the level expected for promotion to the rank of Professor or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty/Administration Manual. Only faculty members holding the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible for a superior rating, except that tenured Assistant and Associate Professors who lack the terminal degree but who otherwise could meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor are also eligible for superior ratings.

Rationale: The revision would clarify the language regarding who is eligible for the superior rating. The PTR Committee has consistently held to this interpretation since the process was initiated.

Proposal #2:
Revise section 1 (Introduction):

A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review, with the exception of the first review after tenure, which will be conducted during the seventh year unless the faculty member is seeking promotion the same year.

(Deferment reason (c) should remain in the policy but will be used only occasionally with this change.)

Rationale: Currently faculty members who plan to seek promotion to Professor in their seventh year must seek a deferment in the sixth year. The committee believes this will result in a reduction in confusion and paperwork for these automatic deferrals.

Ms. Gurganus noted that this proposal was endorsed by last year’s committee as well as this year’s. She told the Senate that the PTR committee has dealt with numerous applications for a “Superior” rating from people who were not eligible. The committee wants the eligibility requirements to be spelled out more clearly. Bob Mignone said he had been on the committee last year, and that the requirements for a professor to earn a “Superior” rating were equivalent to those required for promotion to Full Professor. The first part of the policy clarifies these requirements, he said. The second part of the proposed change policy would change the PTR calendar, making it occur in the 7th year.
rather than the 6th year after becoming an Associate. This would allow them to come up for Full first, rather than going through PTR, then going through promotion the following year. Present policy allows those faculty to write a request for such a deferral, Ms. Gurganus said, and 15-16 faculty had to do that this year. She noted that this recommendation will require approval from CHE as well as the Provost. Both these recommendations were passed by the Senate.

Constituents’ Concerns
Robert Russell (Art History) presented a concern from his department. They believe that teaching and research awards tend to go to senior faculty, and they propose the creation of teaching and research awards for junior faculty. Mr. Russell said he would make a formal motion to this effect next fall.

With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger